R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 055 24

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE LIBERAL ARTS.

BY- BROWN, LEIBA

COLUMBIA UNIV., NEW YORK, BUR. OF APPL. SOC. RES.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-087 PUB DATE MAY 66

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8281

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.28 82P.

DESCRIPTORS- *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *LIBERAL ARTS, COORDINATION, *ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE, RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES, *RESEARCHERS, *GROUP RELATIONS, NEW YORK CITY

THE EXTENT OF CONTACT BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS AND THEIR COLLEAGUES IN THE LIBERAL ARTS WAS INVESTIGATED TO LOCATE THOSE ORGANIZATIONAL CONDITIONS IN UNIVERSITIES WHICH WOULD PROMOTE THE EXCHANGE OF THE INTELLECTUAL RESOURCES OF BOTH GROUPS. THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY INCLUDED SURVEYING THE CONTACTS WHICH EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS HAVE WITH THE LIBERAL ARTS, IDENTIFYING THE SOCIAL STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS WHICH FOSTER INTEGRATION OF BOTH GROUPS, AND LOCATING THOSE CONDITIONS WHICH SERVE TO WIDEN THE GAP BETWEEN THEM. SUCH AREAS AS HISTORICAL FACTORS, THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY POWER STRUCTURE, ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS, CAREER LINES, ROLE OF THE FUNDING AGENCIES, AND THE CONSEQUENCES OF DIFFERENT DEGREES OF INTEGRATION OF THE TWO GROUPS WERE STUDIED. WHILE FINAL CONCLUSIONS AWAITED FURTHER DATA, THE EXISTING DATA SUGGESTED THAT CONTACTS BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS AND THE LIBERAL ARTS WERE NOT FULLY INSTITUTIONALIZED WHERE THEY DID EXIST. A PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION WAS THAT BRINGING LIBERAL-ARTS-TRAINED RESEARCHERS INTO SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION SHOULD BE SUPPLEMENTED BY ENCOURAGING EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHERS TO AFFILIATE DIRECTLY WITH PROFESSIONAL SOCIETIES IN THE LIBERAL ARTS. (GD)

ED011055

NAS

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BUREAU OF

APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Arts and Humanities Branch
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. - Rm. 3-2-065
Washington, D. C. 20202

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE LIBERAL ARTS

Cooperative Research Project No. S-087 5-8281

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FOR LIMITED DISTRIBUTION

BUREAU OF APPLIED SOCIAL RESEARCH

Columbia University

605 West 115th Street
New York, N. Y. 10025

The research carried out by the Bureau is supported by foundation grants and by contracts with government, business, educational, religious, social welfare and other organizations. A bibliography of Bureau books, monographs, articles in scholarly journals, and unpublished research reports may be obtained from the Bureau's Librarian.

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE LIBERAL ARTS

Cooperative Research Project No. S-087 5-8281

Leiba Brown, under sponsorship of
Professor Paul F. Lazarsfeld,
Department of Sociology;
Associate Director
Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
New York, New York
May, 1966.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of tables and charts.	2
Introduction.	4
Design of the study.	6
I Statement of the research problem.	7
II Objectives and hypotheses.	9
III Related research.	11
IV Procedures.	17
Findings to date.	19
I Existing arrangements for contact between educational researchers and liberal arts professors.	20
II Utilization of arrangements by professors.	37
III Problems of recruitment.	45
IV Selected comparison between educational researchers and behavioral scientists.	55
V Settings for contact: some implications.	63
VI Notes.	66
Appendix -- Design of specific instruments.	67

LIST OF TABLES AND CHARTS

Page

Table 1. Existing arrangements with academic departments and other professional schools.

Table 2. Existing arrangements of research units with academic departments and other professional schools.

Table 3. Research quality according to various arrangements with the liberal arts and sciences.

Table 4. Comparison of joint arrangements in high quality schools versus all others.

Table 5. Comparison of joint arrangements in schools where dean ranks research first and schools where teaching ranked first.

Table 5a. Comparison of joint arrangements in schools where dean ranks research first and schools where all other activities ranked first.

Table 6. Comparison of joint arrangements in schools where education faculty ranks research first over teaching.

Table 7. Comparison of the per cent difference in existence of joint arrangements with academic departments due to ranking of research first by education deans and education faculty.

Table 8. Comparison of joint arrangments in schools where field service is a problem and those where no problem exists.

Table 9. Comparison of participation by educational researchers and behavioral scientists in selected types of interchange.

Table 10. Comparison of participation by educational researchers and behavioral scientists in informal and formal interchanges.

Table 11. Comparison of participation by educational researchers and behavioral scientists in informal and formal interchanges occuring at least monthly.

Page

Table 12. Comparison of time budget information for educators, psychologists, and sociologists.

Table 13. Age distributions of educators, psychologists, and sociologists.

INTRODUCTION

A great potential exists for exchange of intellectual resources between researchers in education and those in the liberal arts disciplines. However, the present state of interaction between scholars "across the street" falls far short of what it might be. At present, there is a wide gap between education and the liberal arts. In some universities the gap is so great that leading researchers in education speak of "prejudice" against education on the part of liberal arts scholars, and some liberal arts professors contend that "brains are scarce" in education.

The present study was undertaken to learn more about the extent of the gap. In addition, we have attempted to pinpoint some of the conditions which would lessen the gap and support both contact and exchange of intellectual resources between education and the liberal arts.

This report is organized into two major sections, covering the design of the study and the findings to date. The analysis of data is still in progress, and additional findings are to be reported in the forthcoming dissertation based on these materials.

We present the design section first. Here we describe the problem around which the research is focused, the objectives of the study, the related literature, and the procedures

used. Further details about procedures are presented in an appendix.

The second section -- findings to date -- has five chapters. First, we survey the institutional arrangements for contact between educational researchers and their liberal arts colleagues in a number of universities. Secondly, we describe the contacts maintained by individual professors at some of these universities. Next, problems of recruiting the liberal arts scholar to do research in education are discussed. Then, some selected comparisons between education and behavioral science professors are presented. Finally, we suggest some implications of our findings, including suggestions for the direction of future contacts between education and the liberal arts.

Design of the Study

Contents

I -- Statement of the research problem.

II -- Objectives and hypotheses.

III -- Related research.

IV -- Procedures.

STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The research was focused on learning the extent of and conditions for the normative gap between educational research and that in the liberal arts. The purposes of the investigation were, briefly: to survey the contacts which researchers in education have with the liberal arts; to spell out the social structural conditions or arrangements which make for the integration of educational research with the tradition of scholarship in the liberal arts; and to pinpoint which arrangements may serve to widen the gap between them.

In the proposal, it was suggested that educational research is often carried out in total or partial isolation from the liberal arts. (See Appendix A, pages 1-2). This isolation may be preserved and fed, in some universities, by both the liberal arts professors and the schools of education. The liberal arts professors often claim that there is no need for a special discipline of education. On the other hand, both faculty and administration in the schools of education have been faced with precisely the task of professionalization. In the short run, this goal of professionalization of education has led to the neglect of research goals in many schools. In Appendix A, the problem was summarized as follows:

> Educators have been in close touch with local communities and have been pressed by them into focusing on applied rather than basic research, in order to meet the immediate needs of the schools. The applied nature of much of educational inquiry tends to further

> separate it from the arts and sciences: education faculties develop different organizational goals from other parts of the university, as well as separate in-bred research traditions, and perhaps a different set of reference groups by which to gage their own achievements.
>
> The professionalization of education contributes further to its isolation by providing better conditions for communication and group consciousness among educators than exist between educators and other parts of the academic community. Education schools breed their own psychologists, sociologists, philosophers, etc. and become "universities within universities."

Where there is contact between educational researchers and their colleagues in the liberal arts disciplines, this contact may take the form of conflict. In addition, where contacts exist education is often viewed by all participants as having less prestige than the disciplines. This fact, alone, may perpetuate the conflict by permitting the liberal arts professors to shrug off or ignore the potential or actual contributions of educational researchers rather than giving them serious consideration.

The research, therefore, is concerned not only with the extent of contacts between educational research and the liberal arts, but also with which contacts are now being utilized for cooperative relations and which might become more cooperative in the long run.

In the next section, we will list some of the guiding lines of thought which went into the design of the study.

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES.

The following discussion describes some of the guidelines used to design the study. We attempted to take into consideration a number of general factors which might influence relations between educational research and the liberal arts, additional hypotheses emerged after some preliminary data had been gathered from pilot interviews. On the whole, the practices and attitudes of educational researchers were considered to be the dependent variables, and the independent variables were the organizational structures and mechanisms for contact between education and the behavioral science disciplines. The study also gathered descriptive information about the contacts which take place, as necessary background for analyzing the possible effects of these contacts. Furthermore, it was necessary to study some of the conditions which promote these contacts in the first place, and for this purpose, to consider the contacts themselves as dependent variables.

As stated in Appendix A, pages 6 to 8, some of the factors to be studied included the following: Historical factors were studied. For example, the existence of a long tradition separating the school of education from the disciplines was expected to influence contacts. Secondly, we wanted to study the role of the university power structure. We attempted to explore the interest in research and the efforts made to recruit researchers by the deans and faculty in both the school of education and in the graduate school.

Next, organizational arrangements were included. The degree to which contacts were institutionalized was to be explored. Formal versus informal contacts were to be compared. The effect of the locus of control over the doctoral degree program was to be studied. The efficacy of shared activities versus purely ceremonial contacts was to be assessed. The frequency of contacts was to be studied. The role of research bureaus as a special type of arrangement for contact was considered. Finally, it was expected that elites among the researchers would participate differently than others.

The fourth topic was career lines. During the course of the investigation it became clear that it was not sufficient to study the participation of education-trained versus liberal-arts-trained researchers. Rather, the deans seemed to prefer to bring in liberal-arts-trained professors for research purposes. Therefore, we asked, under what conditions can these researchers and professors be recruited to education and persuaded to stay?

Fifthly, we included material on the role of the funding agencies. It was expected that the extent of scholarly interest on the part of the agencies financing educational research would push the actual research in the direction of the liberal arts tradition rather than the applied tradition. While the research was being carried out, two new developments occurred: the Office of Education funded a number of R and D centers, and was itself reorganized. During the last half of the study, an attempt was made to get some descriptive information on these developments.

Lastly, we planned to study some consequences of different degrees of integration between education and the liberal arts. The objective here was to study two dimensions: the similarity between research practices and attitudes among educational researchers and their colleagues in the liberal arts, and the acceptance of educational research by the scholars in the disciplines. It was expected that the similarity would be more pronounced than acceptance, and that this would lead to further isolation of educational researchers.

These, then were the objectives of the study embodied in the topics and hypotheses chosen for inclusion in the instruments. In the next section, we will briefly summarize the related research literature and its bearing upon the study design. We will indicate which aspects of the topic have been dealt with in the literature, and which are unique to the present investigation.

RELATED RESEARCH.

A number of essays have been written which deal with the gap between education and the liberal arts disciplines, but very few of these contain reports of actual empirical research on this topic. Furthermore, the bulk of the literature which does exist consists of impressionistic rather than systematic attempts to pinpoint the causes of the break between the two traditions. Professor Cowley[1] has emphasized the relatively low prestige of education and stressed possible remedies for

this situation, in his general writings on the development and functioning of the system of American higher education. Jones, Keppel and Ulich discuss general causes of the split, including the growth of mass education, the development of a pragmatic philosophy of education, and the emphasis of educationists on the needs of the schools.[2] Borrowman traces the drift from general to professional teacher education, with concomitant encapsulization of education, and stresses the role of the founders of the schools of education in starting the trend toward separateness, because of school and community exigencies.[3] The gap in interests of those concerned with secondary rather than college education is discussed by Wellemeyer.[4]

A valuable history of the conflict between education and the liberal arts which contains a questionnaire survey may be found in Auerbach, "The Opposition to Schools of Education by Professors of the Liberal Arts."[5] Auerbach's study shows that criticisms of education are directed largely at the insufficient emphasis on content within education courses and at the degree of control which educators are alleged to have over university decisions. This information, however, leaves unanswered the questions of the nature of the contacts between education and the liberal arts which provoke such criticisms, and the variation of attitudes toward education in liberal arts universities with varying types of organizations and patterns of leadership.

There is a body of literature with suggestive discussion on the relation of educational research to the specific field of sociology. Gross lists topics within education which would provide fruitful information for the social sciences, such as organizational studies, expectation analysis, and studies of community-school relations.[6] Brim reviews the literature on education which is relevant to the field of sociology and describes both actual and possible arrangements for contacts between educators and sociologists within the graduate schools.[7] This literature provides a valuable base of ideas to build upon, but contains no empirical research.

Other writers have stressed the desirability of obtaining for education the same contributions which the academic disciplines now bring to the professional schools in law and medicine. McConnell, Anderson, and Hunter discuss the possibility of establishing a core unit of academic departments which would serve to train students and keep up contacts with scholars in all parts of the university through flexible administrative arrangements.[8] Once again, however, this literature contains no empirical research.

Even among the empirical studies which <u>exist</u>, very few specifically discuss the effect of the education-liberal arts relationship on educational research. A survey of about 200 researchers and administrators by Fattu[9] provides information on the opinions of educators about the state of educational

research, and a dissertation by Miller[10] traces the role of field service units in giving direction to educational research. Neither of these deals in any detail with relations with the liberal arts.

Three studies which do touch directly upon the topic of the liberal arts education gap include those done by Wilder, Sieber and Lazarsfeld, and Buswell and McConnell. Sieber and Lazarsfeld surveyed the deans, research coordinators, and research bureau directors in a large number of schools of education. They obtained detailed institutional information on the proportion of the education faculty trained in the liberal arts disciplines, the preferences of the administrators for liberal arts or education faculty, the relation of liberal arts--trained faculty to the training of educational researchers and a number of other topics. Their findings have been used as data for further analysis in this report.[11]

Wilder's study of experts in the field of reading research contains a comparison of experts with Ed.D.'s and Ph.D.'s. He found that the Ph.D.'s scored higher on indices of both research training and research career orientation, controlling for the level of teaching experience the expert had had and the year in which he obtained his degree.[12] In their survey of graduate training in education, Buswell and McConnell found that the Ed.D. programs produce fewer researchers than the Ph.D. programs, and that teaching experience is negatively related to

later research productivity.[13] These findings point to the crucial role played by the Ph.D. program in producing researchers. They strongly suggest that contact with the liberal arts disciplines is one of the key factors accounting for the greater output of research orientated people from Ph.D. programs.

The central point of the present investigation, in contrast to the studies cited above, is to survey the contacts which exist between graduate schools of education and the liberal arts disciplines, and to ascertain the effect of these contacts on educational research.

References

1. W. H. Cowley, Pandemic Writings on American Higher Education. Stanford University, 1957.

2. Howard M. Jones, Francis Keppel, and Robert Ulich, "On the Conflict Between the 'Liberal Arts' and the Schools of Education," The ACLS Newsletter, Vol. V, No. 2, pp. 17-38.

3. Merle L. Borrowman, The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

4. J. Fletcher Wellemeyer, Jr., "Scholars Look at Education," The ACLS Newsletter, Vols. V, No. 2, pp. 29-46.

5. Eugene Charles Auerbach, "The Opposition to Schools of Education by Professors of the Liberal Arts -- A Historical Analysis." Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Southern California, 1957.

6. Neal Gross, "Some Contributions of Sociology to the Field of Education," Harvard Educational Review, 29 (Fall, 1959), pp. 275-287.

7. Orville Brim, Sociology and the Field of Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

8. T. R. McConnell, G. Lester Anderson and Pauline Hunter, "The University and Professional Education," in Education for the Professions: The Sixty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, edited by Nelson B. Henry. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

9. N. A. Fattu, "A Survey of Educational Research at Selected Universities," in Educational Research, First Annual Phi Delta Kappa Symposium, Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1960.

10. Harry K. Miller, Jr., "A Study of the Field Service and Research Units of Ten Schools of Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1958.

11. Sam D. Sieber and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "The Organization of Educational Research," Cooperative Research Project #1974, final report.

12. David E. Wilder, "The Reading Experts: A Case Study of the Failure to Institutionalize an Applied Science of Education." Unpublished dissertation, Columbia University, 1966.

13. Guy T. Buswell and T. R. McConnell, et al., Training for Educational Research. Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1966.

PROCEDURES.

Some data for the project were already existing, and were analyzed by the writer. In addition, new materials were collected by the writer. The sources of data include the following:

A. Institutional surveys of the deans, research coordinators, and research bureau directors in 107 graduate schools of education and 151 affiliated research units. These data were collected by Sieber and Lazarsfeld as part of Cooperative Research Project #1974. In each survey, questions were designed and inserted by the writer. These questions covered the contacts between schools of education or research bureaus and the liberal arts faculty in the academic departments and professional schools. The responses to these questions about contact with liberal arts were then analyzed by the writer in relation to other characteristics of the schools of education.

B. Data collected by the writer have three parts: 1) a questionnaire survey of 535 educational researchers in 77 of the 107 graduate schools of education mentioned above. Included in this survey was a subsample of educational research leaders. 2) A study of representatives from the liberal arts. Specifically, a sample of 727 behavioral scientists taken from the psychology and sociology departments at the same 77 schools was studied, using a mail questionnaire. 3) Interviews were conducted with 21 leading representatives from both education and the liberal arts, including several people who had spent considerable time in both a liberal arts department and a school

of education. The purpose of the interviews was two-fold: to provide supplementary qualitative information in depth about the research leaders, and to provide case materials about the institutions where these informants had been or were presently located. The bulk of the interviews came from two major universities, which form case studies in themselves. 4) In addition, miscellaneous documentary materials were utilized and will be described in the appendix.

The return rates for the different institutional questionnaires were as follows: the return on the deans' questionnaire was 68 per cent. For the research coordinators, the return was 82 per cent. The bureau directors' instrument was returned for about 90 per cent of those research units actually affiliated with graduate education programs.

The three questionnaires sent out to professors yielded the following returns. The rate was 62 per cent for educationists, 43 per cent for psychologists, and 52 per cent for sociologists.

These different sources of information permit an analysis of both institutional reports of contacts between education and liberal arts, and the actual utilization of existing opportunities for contact by individual professors and researchers.

The details of the design of each aspect of the study, including a brief description of the instruments, the sampling procedures and return rates, and the strategy of analysis are described in the appendix.

Findings to Date

Contents

Chapter I: Existing arrangements for contact between educational researchers and liberal arts professors

Chapter II: Utilization of arrangements by professors

Chapter III: Problems of recruitment

Chapter IV: Comparison of educational researchers with psychology and sociology professors: similarities and differences

Chapter V: Settings for contact: some implications

CHAPTER I

Existing Arrangements for Contact Between Educational Researchers and Liberal Arts Professors

The first step in the investigation was to ascertain what possibilities for contact existed in those activities of the school of education where liberal arts professors could be expected to play a role: the doctoral program and the conduct of research. First we shall report the distribution of formal arrangements given by the deans and research coordinators. Secondly, we shall indicate how many of these arrangements exist for the research bureaus. Then the chapter will continue with a discussion of the role played by research goals in promoting these arrangements. Several factors will be considered. The arrangements will be shown to vary with the quality of research in the schools of education. The implied effect of the presence of the liberal arts professors on research quality will then be whosn to be further related to the attitudes, preferences and policies of the education deans and faculty. Where research is a prime goal, these arrangements for contact between liberal arts professors and education professors are more likely to exist. The existence of such arrangements will be then shown to be related to the proportion of the budget devoted to research. Finally, possible interference resulting from the competing goals of field service and teaching will be discussed.

A. Arrangements for contact reported by the deans and coordinators.

The deans and coordinators were asked to indicate the existence of several types of arrangements for contact between the school of education and the academic departments and other professional schools. Their responses are reported in Table 1.

TABLE 1.--Existing arrangements with academic departments and other professional schools.

Type of arrangement	Existing with academic departments	Existing with professional schools
Examination committees for the doctorate	88%	57%
Joint teaching appointments	68	38
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars	64	38
Visiting professors for teaching	49	40
Joint selection of faculty	40	27
Joint research appointments	38	24
Visiting research professors	26	20

The table first describes contacts with the academic departments: the most frequently found arrangements are in connection with teaching and the doctoral program. They include examination committees for the doctorate, which exist in 88 per cent of the schools, and joint teaching appointments, which exist in 68 per cent of the schools. Similarly, committees with interdisciplinary

composition exist in 64 per cent of the schools. On the other hand, joint research appointments exist in 38 per cent of the institutions.

This pattern is not so pronounced with respect to relations with the other professional schools. However, there are still more schools with examination committees and joint teaching appointments than there are schools with joint research appointments.

It may also be noted that 40 per cent of the schools have liberal arts professors from the academic departments participating in the selection of the education faculty, while for the professional schools this occurs in 27 per cent of the cases.

The doctoral program is also a base for contact with liberal arts faculty in other respects. Fifty-eight per cent of the schools reported that they offered courses which were given only in departments outside of education. Within the school of education, however, only 25 per cent of the schools had any divisions or departments where the majority of the faculty had been trained outside of education. In the present situation, then, this places the burden of providing information about the liberal arts disciplines on arrangements with other parts of the university rather than with professors trained in liberal arts but housed in the schools of education.

The deans and coordinators were also asked to evaluate the existing arrangements for contact. Twenty-eight schools responded to this question. Of these 78 per cent indicated

that they found the relations fruitful, while 22 per cent found them unsatisfactory. Thirty-four per cent mentioned that the relations were very fruitful or excellent.

The deans were also asked to cite some of the problems they encountered with these arrangements. Among the difficulties mentioned, those most frequently cited were problems of time and intellectual disagreements. A few typical comments are given here, to indicate the general flavor of reactions to this question:

> "Excellent, but one problem encountered is with the difficulty of relating scholars to problems of the lower schools."
>
> "All academic departments, with the exception of history, are quite cooperative. They cannot give as much time as would be ideal."
>
> "...The main problem is no late afternoon or evening classes in non-professional courses, thus preventing extensive scheduling among graduate education majors; many of whom are part-time."

That such problems posed real barriers to the utilization of formal arrangements for contact was also indicated by the interviews with administrators and research leaders. One leading researcher who had been trained in liberal arts and was currently affiliated with both a school of education and an academic department, commented negatively on both the lack of time and the intellectual problems he encountered:

> "There are . . . negative effects of the joint appointment: there is a double load, double service on committees and exams . . . there are two sets of expectations and limited time. This creates a strain.

> "When I came to (X university) . . . several appointments had been made which I was not aware of. Had my family and furniture not been enroute, I would have left. For one year, I participated in this (research) operation. It was intellectually dissatisfactory. People didn't have research competencies or a sense of what was the relevant issue."

The role which such difficulties play in preventing the full utilization of existing arrangements for contact will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

B. Arrangements for contact reported by the directors of bureaus and other research units.

In the contacts reported by the research bureaus, the focus shifts away from the doctoral program's activities to the possibilities presented by various research activities. The extent of these types of contact is reported in Table 2.

The most frequently cited type of interchange was consultation. Interdisciplinary committees, joint research appointments, and joint research publications were mentioned with about equal frequency. Arrangements for visiting professorships were rare. Each type of arrangement was more frequently found with the academic departments than with the professional schools.

Further evidence that these interchanges are rare is cited by Sieber and Lazarsfeld. Out of the six arrangements listed, the mean number of arrangements with academic departments was 2.04, and the mean number of arrangements with professional schools was 1.21.

TABLE 2.--Existing arrangements of research units with academic departments and other professional schools.

Type of arrangement	Exists with academic departments	Exists with professional schools
Consultation on specific studies	56%	40%
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars concerned with scholarly issues	35	19
Joint research appointment	32	16
Joint research publications	28	16
Interdisciplinary conferences	25	18
Visiting professors from other universities for research	19	14
Number of units	(54)	(57)

C. Existence of interchanges related to quality of research.

Analyses done by Sieber and Lazarsfeld indicated that each type of joint arrangement was more often found in schools which were rated as doing the best research than in other schools.[1] The data are reproduced here in Table 3. In addition, this relationship was found to hold after controlling for the reputation of the university as a whole.[2]

This finding suggests the contribution to research quality in education which can be made by the liberal arts professor. Further examination of Table 3 reveals that a greater difference is made in the case of joint selection of faculty (50%) than in the case of joint research appointments (31%) and joint teaching

TABLE 3.--Research quality according to various arrangements with the liberal arts and sciences.

	% schools of education doing best research	% difference
Participation of non-education professors in the selection of the faculty of education		
Yes	52% (29)	50%
No	2% (41)	
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars which are concerned with scholarly issues.		
Yes	33% (38)	33%
No	0% (22)	
Joint research appointments		
Yes	41% (29)	31%
No	10% (41)	
Visiting professors from other universities for research.		
Yes	44% (18)	29%
No	15% (52)	
Joint teaching appointments		
Yes	29% (52)	23%
No	6% (18)	
Visiting professors from other universities for teaching.		
Yes	27% (37)	9%
No	18% (33)	

appointments (23%). In the case of joint selection, the liberal arts professors are operating out of a base in the academic departments, while in the case of joint appointments they are partly housed in the school of education. The issue of where to house the liberal arts professors who might contribute to educational research will be discussed in detail in a later chapter. But the lesser difference made by the joint appointments compared with joint selection of faculty suggests that the schools of education are not at present receiving the best potential contributors. Rather, these people remain in the academic departments and only influence research indirectly by setting standards for the recruitment of new professors.

D. Some factors influencing the existence of formal arrangements for contact with liberal arts.

The existence of contact occasions depends upon both the general university context and specific actions taken by centers of power within the university. The most important overall characteristic influencing the existence of arrangements is the quality of the university, as measured by its Keniston quality rating. The rating procedure classifies the universities into two groups: the top 22 and all others. Table 4 shows that each type of formal arrangement for contact is found more often in the high quality universities than in all other universities.

TABLE 4.--Comparison of joint arrangements in high quality schools versus all others.

I. Arrangements with the academic departments

Type of Arrangements	Exists in top 22 schools	Exists in all others	Per cent difference
Joint examination committees for the doctorate	100%	93%	7%
Joint selection of faculty	86	30	56
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars	93	63	30
Joint teaching appointments	100	68	32
Joint research appointments	65	34	31
Joint visiting professors for teaching	79	47	32
Joint visiting professors for research	42	21	21
	N=14	N=56	

II. Arrangements with the other professional schools

Type of Arrangements	Exists in top 22 schools	Exists in all others	Per cent difference
Joint examination committees for the doctorate	79%	55%	24$
Joint selection of faculty	65	20	45
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars	58	32	26
Joint teaching appointments	50	34	26
Joint research appointments	42	18	24
Joint visiting professors for teaching	75	46	29
Joint visiting professors for research	35	17	17
	N=14	N=56	

The existence of arrangements with the liberal arts departments also depends upon the extent to which research is a major goal of the school of education. The deans were asked to estimate how they and various other power groups in the university would rank the activities of research, teaching, service, etc., according to their importance as responsibilities of the faculty. Table 5 shows that in schools where the education dean ranks research first, arrangements exist more often with the academic departments and the other professional schools. In this table, the relationship with liberal arts when research is placed over teaching goals is shown first. Then we show the extent of arrangements when research is considered more important than all other goals.

In the case of arrangements with the academic departments, the greatest difference is made by the dean's policy in joint research appointments. This is less true for relations with the other professional schools, where joint teaching and examination committees are most affected.

There is a strong relationship between the education dean holding research as a major goal and the extent to which joint research with academic departments exists. Other liasons with the professional schools are also related to the dean's ranking of research.

TABLE 5.--Comparison of joint arrangements in schools where dean ranks research first and schools where teaching ranked first.

I. Arrangements with academic departments

Type of arrangement	Exists where deans ranks research first	Exists where dean ranks teaching first	Per cent difference
Joint examination committees for the doctorate	100%	92%	8%
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars	72	70	2
Joint teaching appointments	83	75	8
Joint research appointments	67 N=48	34 N=47	33

II. Arrangements with other professional schools

Type of arrangement	Exists where dean ranks research first	Exists where dean ranks teaching first	Per cent difference
Joint examination committees for the doctorate	83%	52%	31%
Interdisciplinary comimittees or seminars	56	34	22
Joint teaching appointments	67	32	35
Joint research appointments	44 N=48	27 N=47	17

TABLE 5a.--Comparison of joint arrangements in schools where dean ranks research first and schools where all other activities ranked first.

I. Arrangements with academic departments

Type of arrangement	Exists where dean ranks research first	Exists where dean ranks all other first	Per cent difference
Joint teaching appointments	83%	67%	14%
Joint research appointments	67 N=18	33 N=3	34

II. Arrangements with professional schools

Type of arrangement	Exists where dean ranks research first	Exists where dean ranks all other first	Per cent difference
Joint teaching appointments	67%	0	67%
Joint research appointments	44 N=8	0	44

A similar analysis was done to ascertain the relationship of joint arrangements to the rank given research by the education faculty. The information in presented in Table 6.

This table shows that arrangements with liberal arts are more likely to exist in schools where the education faculty ranks research first over teaching goals. As is the case with the deans, the relationship with arrangements with the academic departments is seen most in the joint research arrangements, while the focus in relations with the professional schools is on joint teaching appointments and doctoral committees.

TABLE 6.--Comparison of joint arrangements in schools where education faculty ranks research first over teaching.

I. Arrangements with academic departments

Type of arrangement	Exists where faculty ranks research first	Exists where faculty ranks teaching first	Per cent difference
Joint examination committees for the doctorate	100%	67%	33%
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars	84	70	14
Joint teaching appointments	100	72	28
Joint research appointments	84 N=6	38 N=57	46

II. Arrangements with professional schools

Type of arrangement	Exists where faculty ranks research first	Exists where faculty ranks teaching first	Per cent difference
Joint examination committees for the doctorate	100%	56%	44%
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars	67	37	30
Joint teaching appointments	84	34	50
Joint research appointments	50 N=6	17 N=3	33

In the case of contacts with the academic departments, the relationship of joint arrangements to rank given research is greater for the education faculty than for the deans. This is indicated in Table 7.

TABLE 7.--Comparison of the per cent differences in existence of joint arrangements with academic departments due to ranking of research first by education deans and education faculty

Type of Arrangement	% Difference in contacts where education faculty rank research first	% Difference in contacts where education dean ranks research first
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars	14%	2%
Joint teaching appointments	28	8
Joint research appointments	46	33

The effect of the deans' preference for research over other goals can be further demonstrated by looking at the actual allocation of resources for research. This is very clearly seen in the case of the research bureaus, where effort can be concentrated on research or services according to the preference of the administrators. The data collected by Lazarsfeld and Sieber for research bureaus show that the mean number of relationships with academic departments increases with the proportion of the budget allocated to research. In addition, research bureaus more often have over 25 per cent of their staff teaching in the academic departments when a greater proportion of the budget is spent for research. Those bureaus which spend more on research are also those which recruit more personnel from behavioral science departments, both within and outside of the university where they are located.

Competition between research and service goals.

It has been suggested by many observers that service goals seriously interfere with research goals in schools of education. An analysis was done to see if less effort was devoted to establishing arrangements with liberal arts in those schools which reported that competition from service goals was a problem. The deans were asked,

> "It is sometimes claimed that the desire of school systems for field services draws personnel and resources away from educational research. Do you consider this a problem in your institution?..."

Table 8 indicates that competing service goals do indeed make a difference.

TABLE 8.--Comparison of joint arrangements in schools where field service is a problem and those where no problem exists.

I. Case of academic departments

Type of arrangement	Exists where service is problem	Exists where service is not problem	Per cent difference
Joint teaching	55%	79%	+24%
Joint research	22 N=9	45 N=58	+23

II. Case of professional schools

Type of arrangement	Exists where service is problem	Exists where service is not problem	Per cent difference
Joint teaching	33%	38%	+ 5%
Joint research	0 N=	24 N=	+24

Relations with the academic departments are most related to the competing goals of field service. Where no problem is reported to exist, 24 per cent more schools have joint teaching appointments, and 23 per cent more schools have joint research appointments. The same pattern holds true for relations with the other professional schools, but the differences are not as pronounced.

Sieber and Lazarsfeld offer further evidence to indicate that competing goals do affect the emphasis on research, which in turn affects contacts with the liberal arts. They show that where public schools influence the goals of the school of education, the mean number of researchers per school is smaller. (Size of school was held constant.) Since public schools are more likely to expect the school of education to perform service activities, this finding strongly suggests that service goals detract from research goals. These issues are discussed in detail in the report for project #1974 submitted by Sieber and Lazarsfeld and will not be elaborated here. Their findings, however, emphasize the relation between the school systems outside the university and the existence of arrangements for contact with liberal arts disciplines within the university.

To summarize briefly, we have taken a look at the existing distribution of institutional arrangements for contact between education and the liberal arts. Then the existence of joint arrangements was shown to be related to three types of factors: 1) university quality; 2) the ranking of research over teaching and other activities by deans and education

faculty, and 3) the existence of a reported "problem" whereby field service drains personnel away from research. In the next chapter, we will examine the contacts reported by individual professors.

CHAPTER II

Utilization of Existing Arrangements by Educational Researchers and Behavioral Scientists

In the previous chapter, we examined the formal possibilities which existed for promoting contact between educational researchers and their colleagues in the liberal arts disciplines. In the present chapter, we shall examine the patterns of contact actually utilized by researchers. First, the asymetrical nature of contacts between educational and behavioral science scholars will be discussed. Secondly, formal contacts will be shown to lage behind informal ones. With this in mind, the possible failure of schools of education to fully institutionalize the formal arrangements will be discussed. Finally, the types of problems mentioned in connection with contacts will be considered as possible barriers to full institutionalization of the arrangements for contact.

First, consider the asymetrical nature of contacts between educational researchers and the disciplines. Many different disciplines are relevant to education. The educational researcher is not expected to keep up with developments in all of them on his own. Therefore, he is expected to consult with colleagues outside of education on those occasions when he requires information from another field. For example, if he has been trained in educational psychology, he might need to consult behavioral scientists in experimental or social psychology from time to time.

On the other hand, behavioral scientists are not usually expected to consult with educational researchers unless they are concerned with a specific topic in education. Therefore, we asked the behavioral scientists if they had had any interest in educational research, whereas both samples were asked if they had had any contact with their colleagues "across the street".

It was found that contacts were asymetrical. Each specific type of contact was examined. A few examples are presented below in Table 9, for the case of examination committees for the doctorate, conventions, joint research in a bureau, joint research outside of a bureau, and joint teaching. For each type of contact, there is a greater proportion of participants from education than from psychology or sociology. The figures in Table 9 represent the per cent of respondents who reported participating in the given arrangement at least once yearly.[3]

TABLE 9.--Comparison of participation by educational researchers and behavioral scientists in selected types of interchange.

Occasion for interchange	Educational researchers	Psychologists	Sociologists
Examination committees for the doctorate	77%	50%	37%
Conventions, meetings	59	36	13
Joint research in a bureau	29	15	10
Joint research outside of bureau	20	15	10
Joint teaching appointment	17	12	9

Those behavioral scientists who indicated no contact with education were aksed "why not?": was it simply not expected of them, or had they decided not to participate? In most cases, contact with educational researchers had either never occurred to them or they had not gotten around to it. Only 3 per cent of the psychologists and 2 per cent of the sociologists reported that they had decided not to interact with scholars in education. This suggests that behavioral scientists have fewer contacts because it is not a mandatory part of their scholarly role. Even where they may consider such contact, 6 per cent of the psychologists and 10 per cent of the sociologists feel free to say that they never got around to it.

Next we will consider the types of contacts most utilized. It was found that informal contacts were both more extensive and more frequent than formal ones. Table 10 lists the occasions for contact which occur at least yearly. It can be seen that informal contacts are participated in by a greater proportion of respondents than formal contacts.

When contacts taking place at least monthly are considered, the greater extent of informal contacts is even more striking. Table 11 lists some of these contacts, and compares the two groups of interchanges. Here only those interchanges which could reasonably be expected to occur at least monthly were included: joint teaching, joint research, collaboration, participation in university administration, and informal conversations.

TABLE 10.--Comparison of participation by educational researchers and behavioral scientists in informal and formal interchanges.

Type of interchange	Educational researchers	Psychologists	Sociologists
Informal contacts			
Informal conversations with colleagues	94%	70%	69%
Informal conversations with friends or relatives "across the street"	75	55	51
Formal contacts			
Examination committees for the doctorate	77	50	37
Collaboration on articles	65	41	32
Meetings, conventions	59	36	13
Participation in university administration	40	33	25
Professional society committees	34	21	12
Joint research in a research organization	29	15	10
Advisory board of research organization	26	15	14
Joint consultation for school systems	24	12	9
Joint research outside research organization	20	15	10
Interdisciplinary committees or seminars on campus	17	9	9
Joint teaching	17	12	9
Editing professional journal	9	4	6
All other	16	8	8

TABLE 11.--Comparison of participation by educational researchers and behavioral scientists in informal and formal interchanges occuring at least monthly.

Type of interchange	Educational researchers	Psychologists	Sociologists
Informal			
Conversations with colleagues	70%	48%	40%
Conversations with friends or relatives who are scholars "across the street"	62	33	31
Formal			
Participation in university administration	27	13	10
Collaboration on articles	22	9	6
Research in a research organization	17	10	9
Joint research outside of research organization	9	7	6
Joint teaching appointment	10	14	7

The greater incidence of informal contacts strongly suggests that existing formal arrangements are not fully institutionalized. So much effort may be required to activate the formal arrangements or keep them going that respondents are discouraged from utilizing them. The respondents were asked to cite some rewarding aspects of interchanges with scholars across the street. The most frequently mentioned aspect was keeping up or getting information. This item was mentioned by 38 per cent of the educational researchers, 24 per cent of the sociologists, and 20 per cent of the psycholo-

gists. Yet it is likely that the major channel for keeping up is informal conversation, which is being utilized in lieu of more structured channels. Furthermore, when asked which contacts they would like to have (or to expand) the educational researchers most often mentioned joint research and joint teaching. This further suggests that these formal ties are not now operative to the extent that educationists would prefer.

Further clues to the lack of institutionalized contacts may be seen from the extent of "discouraged" responses obtained in answer to the question,

"What were some of the problems encountered?"

<u>All groups indicated a substantial time allocation problem</u> -- e.g., that contacts demanded more time than was available to them. In addition, 22 per cent of the educators, 13 per cent of the psychologists, and 11 per cent of the sociologists referred to some type of communication or "language" problem. This high a proportion of answers on the open-ended question suggests that communication is sporadic and never continues long enough for a common universe of discourse to develop. This means that each effort made ends in frustration on both sides because no results carry over from one occasion to the next. The atmosphere of futility is further suggested by the fact that 7 per cent of the educators, 6 per cent of the sociologists and 9 per cent of the psychologists consider the other side to be "too narrow" in its interests. Finally, 11 per cent of the educators find the behavioral scientists "snobbish" and prejudiced against them. These reactions further reduce

the chances of a prolonged and continuous effort being made to insure the continuation of contacts on a meaningful and stable basis.

We shall cite a few examples of problems encountered to emphasize the discouraging quality of a number of these interchanges. First, education professors find it difficult to deal with colleagues who have limited knowledge and concern with the lower schools.

> "There is no concern for the preparation of teachers either at the public school or college level. Research expertise is the dominant emphasis."

> ". . . their emotional denial of knowledge about a skill in the teaching--learning process."

Secondly, the fact that education has low prestige in the academic hierarchy leads to strong reactions to any possible comments made by the liberal arts professors.

> "Many academic professors think all education professors are partially illiterate and say to me on occasion, 'you are an exception,' supposedly to make me feel better."

The liberal arts professors also find these interchanges discouraging to some extent. The main sources of difficulty cited are performance of education graduate students, over-emphasis on the applied aspects of a discipline, and difficulties in communication. Typical comments refer to difficulties such as these:

> "a failure to understand what I am saying"

> "fuzzy philosophies and uncertain intellectual standards"

> "the 'vocational' bent of professional educators" (at the expense of)

> "problems of scholarship"

It is not possible at this stage in the analysis of results to pinpoint exactly why the formal arrangements are not completely institutionalized. One reason may be tentatively offered: since contacts across the street are asymetrical, the burden of efforts for maintaining these arrangements falls upon the school of education rather than the academic departments. The school of education, however, may be committed to the pursuit of professional goals to the point where it may not expend the extra effort to maintain the structures which would link it to the academic departments. This is especially true in cases where early efforts lead to discouragement. This possibility is mentioned only briefly here, but will be explored much further in the dissertation based on these materials.

In summary we have seen that contacts reported by the three groups of professors were asymetrical: education professors reported more contact than behavioral scientists. Moreover, informal contacts were reported more often than formal ones. This finding suggested that the institutional arrangements for contact we described in Chapter I are not fully institutionalized. Possible barriers to institutionalization were then discussed.

CHAPTER III

Problems of Recruitment

In this chapter we will examine the potential for recruitment of behavioral science professors to the schools of education. First, the hiring preferences of education deans will be examined, using both survey and interview materials. Then the problems of the joint appointment as a device for interchange with liberal arts will be examined. Here, interviews with administrators, researchers, and other professors from several institutions will be culled for observations on several problem areas: the reactions of the liberal arts professor to the emphasis on applications in the school of education, the "double load" of responsibilities and orientations associated with the joint appointment, and the patterns of reaction to the presence of the behavioral scientists on the part of professional educators. Finally, survey data on the conditions under which behavioral science professors will accept a job in a school of education will be discussed in the light of the preceding observations.

Recruitment preferences of deans of education schools.

The Sieber-Lazarsfeld survey of deans obtained information on their hiring preferences. The deans were asked to state whether they preferred to hire an individual whose experience had been mostly either in research or in teaching, for each of eleven departments or fields. Sieber and Lazarsfeld found that, in the schools with high research quality, the recruitment

preference of deans leans toward the researcher rather than towards the teacher. In many of these cases, researchers whose training and experience have been outside of education are preferred. Similarly, the research bureau directors in units which spend a greater proportion of their budget for research have a greater proportion of their staff recruited from behavioral science departments both within and outside of the local institution.

Interviews with administrators also indicate a preference for researchers and an awareness that many of these researchers must of necessity be recruited from outside of education. At one leading university, an influential professor observed that the top schools are leaning more and more towards research and are being followed by some of the other schools:

> "The president and the dean want research oriented men; there are new criteria. The ad hoc committee, chosen by the dean, is the new choosing device. (As a result), X university is paralyzed, has made only one tenure appointment in ten years. Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, the new Stanford -- all these are in transit.
>
> "I can't tell you how many times the phone has rung recently, and the chancellor at the university asks me to spend some time to get new faculty . . . 'We want to make a first rate place out of that swamp'". . .

Yet the desirability of hiring liberal arts professors is qualified: the professor must have an interest in and understanding of the professional goals of education. In many places, this qualification is coupled with the policy of housing the liberal arts professors in the school of education. In the case of joint appointments, this means the education school is preferred

to be the "home base" and the technical source of the salary paid the professor. As one dean remarked,

> "My own position and the position of the president is: house the liberal arts person in our department so he can be in close association with practitioners. He should be trained in the discipline, but committed to study specific educational research."

A leading researcher who has been a bureau director showed a similar preference:

> "We wanted somebody with some experience and reputation and who had written things that showed both interest in education and competence in behavioral science. Very good research people only peripherally interested in education and education people whose work was shoddy were passed over."

In describing the joint appointment, he added:

> "There ought to be a core of bonafied behavioral scientists attached to the education school and teaching the courses."

In sum, attempts to recruit the liberal arts professors include the demands that they have a definite applied interest and that they operate out of a base in the school of education rather than in the academic departments.

Reactions of the liberal arts professors: Emphasis on applications and its consequences.

Next, we will consider the reaction of liberal arts professors to the recruitment preferences of the educationists. We will look at comments made both by behavioral scientists currently associated with education schools and those who have left education.

Perhaps the greatest impasse is to be found in the feeling of the liberal arts professors towards the concerns of practitioners. It is not the ultimate needs of the practitioners which constitute the major difficulty. Rather, it is the use, by colleagues in education, of the practitioners' frame of reference, concepts, terminology, etc. in the choice of a research problem and the statement of research design. <u>The fact that education colleagues do not formulate research problems in the same universe of discourse as liberal arts professors is a major source of frustration</u>. One behavioral science department chairman tried to characterise his reactions to the concentration on applications which he encountered among his doctoral candidates from education:

> "In talking to them about any subject, they always have practical problems in the back of their mind. This means both that they may make valuable suggestions and that they can't follow a purely abstract argument . . . their associations don't run in the same channels as those of (other) psychologists . . . but about quality, I don't know . . ."

In the extreme case, the liberal arts researcher, especially if housed in the school of education, feels that he is apt to lose his disciplinary identity. For example, a leading researcher comments,

> "People get so enmeshed in education that they lose the social science identity, identify too much with the problems of practitioners."

A researcher who has left education tried to pinpoint the specific frustrations he encountered:

> "The school systems want research relevant to issues they choose . . . The critical variables are defined by the client. No one is interested in research that doesn't have application to problems . . . (Yet) nobody wants a study where you . . . get the wrong answers . . . Where a deeply felt area of policy is involved, administration and community leaders feel restricted by research. The school system needs to be free to manuever, so implementing rather than inquiring studies are prefered . . . There is no theoretical guidance, but raw empiricism. They take variables out of the hopper."

A number of respondents in the survey of professors commented similarly. One behavioral scientists noted that "There seem to be discrepant levels of generalization between the educational researcher and the arts researcher." Another respondent objected to the dominant role of "values in education, the applied and practical emphasis". Still another remarked that educationists' "interest seem to be addressed to petty problems and to applied concerns".

In the survey of professors, substantial differences were found between educational researchers and behavioral scientists in attitudes towards applications. Sixty-five per cent of the educationists indicated that practical applications were "moderately important" or "very important" to them, as compared with 37 per cent of the psychologists and 41 per cent of the sociologists. Furthermore, about 20 per cent more behavioral scientists indicated a willingness to do research on a topic where there were no practical applications. These results confirm the feeling of the liberal arts professors that the professional concerns of the school of education are very real and must be confronted whenever contacts with the school of education take place.

Additional frustrations are encountered by liberal arts professors in the teaching appointments. Here the students are considered less able than graduate students from the liberal arts departments. Seventy-six percent of the psychologists and 64 per cent of the sociologists mention that they have taught graduate students in education. These professors were asked to compare the performance of education and behavioral science students. Fifty-six per cent of the psychologists and 41 per cent of the sociologists said that education students were poorer in performance. None said that education students were better. Similarly, in the responses to the question on "problems encountered" in contacts across the street, a number of respondents referred to difficulties in teaching education students. One complained that "Ph.D. students in education frequently seem to have little basic knowledge in the social sciences." Objections to the emphasis on applications carry over into dealings with students.

A third difficulty traceable to the applied focus of concerns in the appointment with a school of education is the reaction of other liberal arts colleagues encountered by the professors who have accepted a joint appointment. First of all, the reaction may be negative because no one from education has ever contributed an outstanding work to that discipline. In such a case, the professors' colleagues may be genuinely concerned that he will get "lost" in education. One influential liberal arts professor remarked,

> "In the field of X it's been a narrow, narrow-minded, ingrown, uninteresting group. It's the kiss of death to get into it. (My colleagues) wouldn't believe I had taken the job. This was the obverse of the greeting I got from education."

Even where education professors have a history of contributions to the discipline, reactions may be negative. Another well known educational researcher indicated that the liberal arts professor who entered education had to have great "psychological security". A former director of a research laboratory in a school of education reported that he experienced difficulty in getting students to work in the lab because of negative comments made to them be their behavioral science professors:

> "Unless I found them and gave them a fellowship, they wouldn't come to the lab. Some of those who worked with me got somewhat punished: 'What in the world are you doing over there?'. . ."

Yet this difficulty may be rephrased as a challenge by some. One professor who was based in a school of education emphasized the challenge:

> "<u>It means educating the whole discipline that there are such problems or else give up</u>. It is a personal challenge. If any of us are successful it will be easier for the next generation."

<u>Time allocation problems of the joint appointment</u>.

The joint appointment also involves the problem of the double load. First consider simply the time allocation difficulties, which may make it more and more difficult to pursue research. One informant described the time problem graphically:

> "I was at one point directing 28 doctoral theses. That was too much. In addition, I also had all the committees in (Department X) and always went to two faculty meetings, two sets of teas, the whole ritual I had to do twice. I had to learn two different sets of rules about what a student had to do and was always getting them mixed up . . . And this meant a double set of people you had to be sociable with. Not that I didn't enjoy it . . . "

But the psychological strain of the joint appointment is an equally important consideration. A leading professor with a joint appointment emphasized this point:

> "The self-image is torn apart. . . There are the demands of mastery of two fields, and one has to behave, more than ordinarily, as an academic professor. There is enough of a difference so there is a strain."

Reaction of the hard core professionals to the liberal arts professors.

The reaction of those in the school of education who emphasize primarily professional goals is still another major problem in the recruitment of behavioral science professors. Although one dean describes these problems as "productive tension," they present the liberal arts professor with the possibility of being isolated, or at best, not being taken seriously. Two patterns of negative reaction were mentioned by the informants;

1. The liberal arts professors may form a separate group, apart from the hard core professionals. This was the case at one major university used as a case study on this project, and was a by-product of the recruitment of entire cadres of liberal arts professors to the staff of the education school in recent years. An observer from the professional side noted the separation which then occurred:

> "In this faculty, the people in the disciplines have Ph.D.'s and discipline identifications. When educationists interact with these people, it is the same as with other arts and science people. Our arts and science people are more likely to have their contacts (across the street) than with education people here, and . . . are more likely to be talking to each other. . . "

2. The individual liberal arts professor may be "quarantined."

A researcher who had left education said that his colleagues among the professional staff had:

> ". . . always invited me but never listened . . . or they listened only if my expertise was consistent with their value premises . . . they warned students to keep me off committees because I was unrealistic . . . each bit of quarantine confirmed my image of anti-intellectualism."

Thus, the possibility of isolation represents a clear hindrance to recruitment, because the isolation may reinforce existing biases and stereotypes rather than breaking them down.

Conditions for accepting a position in education.

In spite of all the difficulties and frustrations discussed above, a substantial proportion of the survey respondents indicated a willingness to accept a job in a school of education. A number of conditions were specified. The most important condition was the opportunity to do research of one's choice. Forty-five per cent of the psychologists and 47 per cent of the sociologists would accept the position if given this opportunity. This specification is in line with the existing feelings among behavioral scientists that the practical concerns of the educationists should not be allowed to constitute a major restriction on their own work.

Other conditions making for the willingness to accept a job in education included: salary increases, a move to a better or more prominant university or a "better location", and an increase in rank. It may be that the actual acceptance of such positions operates under an "information screen" akin to that discussed by Caplow in characterizing recruitment among academic departments: the behavioral scientists find it easier to move to a school of education in another university than to the school of education in the same university.

On the other hand, 40 per cent of the psychologists and 47 per cent of the sociologists said that they would not take the job in education, regardless of any advantages offered. In view of the difficulties associated with a move to a school of education, this large a proportion of refusals is not surprising.

To summarize, we have seen that administrators in schools of education prefer to hire researchers wherever approrpiate, but that they want them housed in the school of education. The liberal arts-trained researchers, on the other hand, resent the stress on applied research in the school of education and mention other sources of difficulty and frustration. However, a substantial proportion of professors now located in liberal arts indicate a willingness to consider a job in education if offered inducements such as rank and salary increases, and the opportunity to do research of one's choice.

CHAPTER IV

Selected Comparisons Between Education, Psychology, and Sociology Professors

The aim of the present chapter is to describe selected similarities and differences among the samples of educationists, psychologists, and sociologists. Three areas will be discussed: attitudes toward applied research, research practices, and background characteristics. It will be shown that the most substantial differences among the three groups of professors surveyed are in the area of their attitudes toward applications of research, e.g., the ideology connected with educational research, rather than in research practices or in background traits. Finally, some preliminary findings on the productivity of the three groups will be discussed in the light of further analysis to be done.

Research ideology.

First consider attitudes toward applied research. The three groups of professors were asked:

> "How important is it to you for the results of your studies to have practical applications?"
>
> _____Very important _____Moderately important
>
> _____Somewhat important _____Not important
>
> _____Prefer a lack of practical applications

The reader will recall from the previous chapter that a substantially larger proportion of the education professors answered either "very important" or "moderately important". Sixty-five

per cent of the education professors gave either of these answers, as compared with 37 per cent of the psychologists and 41 per cent of the sociologists. In addition, only 8 per cent of the educationists said applications were "not important", while the percentages for the psychologists and sociologists were 35 per cent and 29 per cent, respectively. Furthermore, the professors were asked if they would do research on a topic that had no practical applications in the foreseeable future. The proportions of each group who answered "no" were as follows: education -- 27 per cent; psychology -- 9 per cent; sociology -- 9 per cent. In sum, the education professors indicated a greater preference for applied research than did the behavioral scientists.

Attitudes related specifically to the applied nature of <u>educational</u> research <u>per se</u> were also studied. We asked the three groups of professors whether they considered practitioners an essential source of problems or topics on which to do research in education. The education professors were much more likely to feel that the practitioner is essential, while the behavioral scientists tended to be more noncommittal in answering the question. Sixty-eight per cent of the educationists agreed that practitioners are essential, while only 48 per cent of the psychologists and 43 per cent of the sociologists agreed with the statement.

These figures help to document the existence of the much-discussed ideological difference between education and the liberal arts disciplines. The difference is reflected in the leaning

of the education professors toward applied research, the felt necessity for contact with practitioners, and the tendency to shun research which is not immediately practical.

Research practices.

In the area of research practices, the differences between educators and behavioral scientists are less striking. Several types of differences will be discussed here: patterns of allocating time to research versus other work, utilization of channels of scientific communication, receipt of scholarly awards and prizes, and continuities in the interests pursued in research.

The only substantial differences found were with respect to time budget. The respondents were asked to give estimates of the proportion of time they spent in a number of activities: research, graduate and undergraduate teaching, committees, administration, consulting, field service, and other work. The three groups tended to devote about equal relative amounts of time to teaching, but the behavioral scientists spent more time in research than did the educators. On the other hand, the educators spent more time in field service.[4] The relevant figures are given in Table 12:

TABLE 12.--Comparison of the time budget information for educators, psychologists, and sociologists.

Activity	Educators	Psychologists	Sociologists
Percent spending 30% or more of their time in research.	26%	33%	51%
Percent giving less than 5% of time to field service.	41%	69%	81%

Further analysis of the time budgets is planned as part of the dissertation based on these materials, and will attempt to ascertain whether individuals who spend more time in field service actually sacrifice their research time to do so, or whether different individuals are involved in the two activities.

Next consider the area of scientific communication. The professors were asked to rank five of the following channels of communication in order of their importance to them: papers at meetings, abstracts of meetings, abstracts of journals, journals, books, students or assistants, conversations with local colleagues, conversations at conventions or meetings, correspondence, unpublished materials, and presentations in seminars or classes. No differences were found between disciplines.

Next we report some findings on research leadership. Here again, no substantial differences were found. One possible way of defining leadership is sociometric: a leader is one who is chosen by other researchers as such. We asked the respondents to indicate whether they were asked frequently for their advice about research by their colleagues. Relatively equal proportions of the three samples answered "yes" to this question: 75 per cent of the educationists, 73 per cent of the psychologists, and 68 per cent of the sociologists. To get a more discriminating picture of how many <u>top</u> researchers there were in each group, however, we asked about awards, honors, and prizes. From this question, it was learned that 6 per cent of the educators, 10 per cent of the psychologists, and 4 per cent of the sociologists

had been awarded a prize for published research, while about 2 per cent of each group had been named as distinguished professor at their universities. Roughly 16 per cent of each group were members of honor societies, while 13 per cent of the educators, 18 per cent of the psychologists, and 15 per cent of the sociologists had held major offices in their own professional societies. Slightly more behavioral scientists than educationists were awarded postdoctoral fellowships and were invited on special lectureships or as visitng professors. These figures give only the roughest estimate of actual research leadership, however. In the dissertation, a productivity measure combined with a research quality measure will be used to refine the concept of leadership and related it to research practices.

Another area is the patterns of continuity in research interest. One original hypothesis of the study was that educationists would be constrained by the needs of practitioners to continually adapt their research interests to clients, while behavioral scientists would have more freedom to pursue a given line of interest over a long time span. In fact, no differences were found in the preferences of the three groups for continuity in either concepts, methods, or subject matter, although the nature of the inquiry may differ among the three groups.

Background traits: graduate training, age and income.

The behavioral scientists tend to be a somewhat younger group than the educationists. This, in turn, affects the data on their general education and graduate training. The age distributions are as follows:

TABLE 13.--Age distributions of educators, psychologists, and sociologists.

Age	Educators	Psychologists	Sociologists
35 or less	12%	20%	25%
36 - 40	17	23	19
41 - 50	33	33	32
51 - 55	18	6	8
56 or more	18	17	15

The fact that the behavioral scientists are younger is reflected in the relatively high proportion of sociologists who did not have the doctorate at the time this survey was taken. The proportions reporting the doctorate as their highest degree in the three groups were: 95 per cent of the educators, 90 per cent of the psychologists, and 47 per cent of the sociologists. Among the educators, 34 per cent hold Ed.D.'s and 62 per cent hold Ph.D. degrees. The length of graduate education is greater for the educators: 61 per cent report eight or more years, while the corresponding percentages for the psychologists and sociologists are 18 per cent and 44 per cent, respectively. Similarly, the length of time spent on the dissertation varies by discipline. More than two years was required by 22 per cent of the educators, 8 per cent of the psychologists, and fully 37 per cent of the sociologists.[5]

It is clear that the educationists take a relatively long time to complete the doctorate, but this time is not necessarily spent on the dissertation. Rather, professional experience required as part of graduate work, part time work, interrupted studies, etc. probably account for the length of time taken to complete the doctorate.

In addition, the respondents were asked to indicate their undergraduate and graduate major fields. The proportion of educators who had undergraduate majors outside of education is very high: 80 per cent. Of these, 8 per cent majored in psychology, 22 per cent took social studies, 20 per cent took mathematics or natural sciences, and 15 per cent studied humanities. On the other hand, only 45 per cent of the psychologists and 62 per cent of the sociologists took undergraduate majors outside the field of their doctorates.

The last factor to be mentioned in this section is income. Here the three samples did not differ substantially from one another. The great majority of each group reported incomes of at least $10,000.

Productivity.

The data on productivity are considered separately in this final section because they present several problems for futher analysis. The first approximation used to measure productivity was the number of research monographs published. It was found that, controlling for the age of the researchers, there were no

differences in the productivity of the three samples. However, this measure of productivity may be too rough, and a second measure, which controls for the quality of the work will be used in further analysis. The bibliographies of a subsample of each group will be used to separate out those researchers who publish in more prestigeful journals. These researchers will be given higher productivity scores than those who publish an equal amount in journals of lesser prestige. (A small panel of scholars from each field will be asked to rank the journals.) The refined productivity figures will then be reported as part of the dissertation based on this project.

In sum, we see that there are very few differences between educationists and behavioral scientists in research practices and background. The major difference which does appear is in attitudes toward applied research. Educationists are more likely to stress applications.

CHAPTER V

Settings for Contact: Some Implications

We have seen that there exist a number of formal arrangements for contact between the liberal arts disciplines and both the graduate schools of education and their affiliated research bureaus. We have also seen that the professors surveyed do not necessarily utilize these arrangements, but rather engage in a number of informal interchanges. Combined with this stiuation is the fact that more contacts are reported by educators than by behavioral scientists. Finally, the reward systems and reference groups of the educators and the behavioral science professors tend to differ. The educators are much more oriented to the practitioners in education; while the behavioral scientists tend to resent this orientation among the educators. For example, quite a number of the behavioral scientists questioned indicated difficulties encountered in their contacts with educationists as a result of the practitioner-centered approach in education.

The educational researcher is in a conflicting and trying situation. There are few, if any, institutionalized ties to the reward systems which help to motivate the behavioral scientist to produce research. The educational researcher is located in the education school, where all around him the interests of the practitioner are paramount. Yet the deans and administrators expect the educational researcher to produce research of a quality

equal to that of the behavioral scientists. The administrators interviewed in this study tried to solve their problem by recruiting behavioral scientists from outside and housing them in the school of education. This has some efficacy, but the recruitment process poses many new problems, and the liberal arts person may not remain in education.

Another approach seems needed. This would be, briefly, to "hook" the educational researcher into the reward system of the behavioral sciences and other liberal arts disciplines: encourage publication in behavioral science journals, encourage membership in their professional associations, encourage honorary societies with joint memberships and award-granting boards containing liberal arts scholars who are competent to evaluate the contributions of the educational researcher. The newly created National Academy of Education is an example of this approach.

Even when such an approach is used, the educational researcher will still be faced with the fact that his colleagues in the behavioral sciences regard education as having less prestige than the disciplines. And of course the educational researcher continues to differ from them in his interests. But his lines of interest would then be supplemented by contact with the mainstream of the disciplines most relevant to his work, not just with a minority of people in disciplines who happen to have an interest in education.

In view of the fact that many of the findings in this study will be analyzed further, this suggestion has been made in the form of a general approach rather than detailed recommendations. This report has attempted rather to document a number of existing problems in the relation between education and the liberal arts and to suggest an approach which would <u>supplement</u> rather than replace the current policy of many of the deans of schools of education, which often stops at the recruitment of liberal arts professors to the educational faculty.

Notes

1. The measure of research quality used by Sieber and Lazarsfeld was the deans' and coordinators' designation of schools which they personally consider to be doing the best research in the country.

2. The reputational measure used to characterize universities is taken from Hayward Keniston, Graduate Study and Research in the Arts and Sciences at the University Pennsylvania, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959.

3. Very few contacts of any type were reported to occur weekly or more.

4. In time devoted to graduate teaching, there are also some differences: 21 per cent of educators spend more than half their time in graduate teaching, compared to about 5 per cent of the behavioral scientists.

5. The nature of doctoral research in sociology may be one factor prolonging the dissertation period, since many dissertations may include the collection of survey or field data. This procedure is more time consuming than the experimental procedures so often used by psychologists.

APPENDIX

Design of specific instruments in the study.

Deans' and coordinators' institutional questionnaire (data collected by Sieber and Lazarsfeld, analyzed by Brown).

I. Description of the questionnaire. This instrument consisted of a mail questionnaire sent to the deans of 107 graduate schools of education. (In some cases, field representatives administered the questionnaire.) A similar questionnaire was also sent to research coordinators in those schools where the position of coordinator exists. The instrument covered a wide range of information, including the following major topics:

1. Institutional data, including size of faculty, admissions rate, size of doctoral program, etc.
2. Research and other goals of the graduate program, including what the dean understands by the term "research", which groups most affect the emphasis on research over teaching or service, whether researchers are preferred in recruitment of new personnel, etc.
3. Arrangements for research and service, including such topics as the extent of effort expended in research versus teaching or field service, the participation of the dean in the actual conduct of research, and existence of a training program, etc.

4. Field service bureaus: including the existence of such bureaus and the interest shown in them by other parts of the faculty.
5. Research bureaus, including some historical items in addition to the type of questions listed for service bureaus.
6. Research teams outside of bureaus: including information on number and size of projects, research budget, and students working on projects.
7. Individual projects outside of research bureaus.
8. Topics of areas covered in all studies outside of research bureaus.
9. Support for research outside of bureaus.
10. Opinions of the deans on educational research.
11. Personal information about the deans, including background characteristics and experience in research.

The design of the questions themselves varied, and included both checklist and open-ended types of items.

II. Questions inserted by the writer.

The writer inserted a number of questions into both the deans and coordinators questionnaires. These questions are listed in detail in the appendix to this report. In general, the following information was gathered:

1. Proportion of faculty in the graduate school of education who received most of their training outside any school or department of education.

2. Departments or divisions of the educational school whose faculty received most of their graduate training outside of any school or department of education.
3. Extent to which there exist specific contacts with the academic departments and professional schools: e.g., joint teaching or research appointments, participation of non-education professors in the selection of the faculty of education, etc.
4. Extent to which deans would like to have these arrangements.
5. Fruitfulness of these arrangements.
6. Existence of research teams composed of both education and academic or professional school personnel.
7. Opinions of the dean on selected issues concerning relations with the liberal arts disciplines.

III. Analysis.

Variations in the extent of arrangements for contacts with liberal arts were considered in relation to both the quality of research done by the school of education (e.g., as independent variables) and to the preferences of the dean, education faculty and other power holders for research versus other goals (e.g., as a dependent variable). Interference from competing goals such as field service was analyzed. In addition, other organizational and attitudinal variables were run against the extent of liberal arts contacts. These analyses are to be discussed in section 8, Chapter I of this report.

Bureau directors' questionnaire (data collected by Sieber--Lazarsfeld, analyzed by the writer).

I. Description of the instrument.

This instrument was also a mail questionnaire. The general topics which it covered include:

1. Historical information about the research unit, including key events, turning points, and current goals.
2. Administrative control, including the process of and participants in making decisions related to the research goals of the unit.
3. Responsibilities of the director.
4. Activities of the unit, including research topics and types of service performed.
5. Training of graduate students.
6. Composition of professional personnel.
7. Financial support.
8. Opinions on educational research held by the director.
9. Personal information about the director.

The design and style of the questions paralleled those of the study of deans and coordinators.

II. Questions inserted by the writer.

Questions directly relating to the topic of this investigation included:

1. Proportion of professional staff recruited from behavioral science versus education departments, within and outside of the director's own university.

2. Contacts and arrangements now existing with academic departments and professional schools, such as joint research appointments, consultation, visiting professorships, etc.
3. Contacts the director would like to see established.
4. Cognate research being done in other parts of the university.
5. Extent of research personnel who are teaching in the academic departments of professional schools.

III. Analysis.

The lines of inquiry discussed above in connection with the deans and coordinators study were also pursued in the directors' study. In addition, organizational features of the research unit -- such as affiliation with teaching departments, facilitation of professors' work, etc. were analyzed in relation to contact with liberal arts. Results are reported in Section 8, Chapter I, of this report.

Educational Researchers' Questionnaire (data both collected and analyzed by the writer).

I. Selection of the sample.

The sample was chosen with two purposes in mind: to represent a population of professors in education who were researchers, and to include names from the same schools of education which were being studied in the Sieber--Lazarsfeld project. The research budget did not permit the sending of questionnaires to all the schools studied by Sieber and Lazarsfeld. Therefore, some schools were eliminated, including: 1) those which had

not responded to the Sieber--Lazarsfeld questionnaire; 2) those on which case materials were already available and could substitue for the questionnaire; 3) those which did not have either a sociology or psychology department; 4) extremely small schools or departments; 5) one school from each of the other size categories and from each geographic region. The final number of schools to which questionnaires were sent was 77. The number of respondents selected in each school was determined by the size of the school or department of education. The smallest schools received three or four, and the ratio was increased proportionately, with size of school, so that the largest schools received about 15. The purpose of this procedure was to roughly approximate the representation of each school in the population of educational researchers.

Names were chosen from two sources. The primary source was the Registry of Educational Researchers prepared by Robert Bargar at Ohio State University in 1964. This list yielded most of the names for most of the schools. For twelve schools, however, there were no professors listed in Bargar's Registry. In five other cases, more names were needed for the sample than existed in the Registry. Therefore a second source was used: the 1964-65 catalogs of the graduate schools of education. Respondents were then randomly selected. The catalog listings presented an additional difficulty, since there was no way of ascertaining whether any professor listed there actually was a researcher. This difficulty could be partly overcome by the inclusion in the questionnaire of an item indicating whether the respondent had done research.

It was also decided to limit the list of potential respondents to those holding the rank of assistant professor or above. This was done in order to minimize the loss of respondents due to high mobility on the part of instructors in the early stages of their careers. In addition, it was hoped that this procedure would increase the chances of researchers being included rather than young faculty who were so new that they had not had ample time or opportunity to produce research.

II. Return rate.

A total of 535 questionnaires were sent to the 77 schools. Two mailings were carried out, and a reminder letter was sent. To date, 62 per cent have been returned.

The cut-off date for processing the returns for this report was January 15. In view of the fact that the Office of Education is to receive copies of the dissertation based on this project in addition to the present report, processing of later returns will be done as they come in. The results will be fully reported in the dissertation, but are not expected to be substantially different from those reported here.

III. Design of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire covered the following topics:

1. Contacts of educational researchers with professors in the liberal arts departments, including formal and informal arrangements, joint teaching or research, consultation, etc. The frequency of contacts, the relative salience of contacts, and the satisfactions and problems encountered were covered.

2. Features of research, including nature of topics studied, attitudes to applied research, productivity, communication channels, researchers' time budgets, professional honors or awards, etc.
3. Attitudes to selected issues in education, including opinions on the prestige and quality of educational research, preferences in training, role of practitioners, etc.
4. Background information, including career history, education, membership in professional associations, journals read, age, income, etc.

The instrument was designed so that responses on productivity, honors, memberships, etc. could be combined into an index of leadership in research. Those who scored high on this index could then be analyzed as a separate subsample.

Behavioral scientists questionnaire.

I. Sample.

Questionnaires were sent to 367 psychologists and 340 sociologists in the academic departments of the aforementioned 77 schools. For both samples the lists of names were obtained from the 1964-65 catalogs of the graduate school of education. In addition, for the sociology sample, the catalog listings were checked against the listings in Graduate Departments of Sociology, published for 1965 by the American Sociological Association. Random numbers were used to select the names, and the number of names for each department was kept proportional to the size of the department. Only those with the rank of assistant professor or more were included in the sample.

II. Return rates.

There were two mailings, in addition to a reminder letter. The return rate was 43 per cent for the psychology sample and 52 per cent for the sociology sample. The cut-off date for processing these returns for the final report was January 20, 1965. As in the case of the educational researchers' questionnaire, however, later returns will be processed as they come in and reported in the dissertation.

III. Design of the instrument.

The following topics were covered:

1. Acquaintance with educational research on the part of behavioral scientists: e.g., interest in educational research, recent professional contact with scholars in education, reasons for lack of contact, development of interest in education.
2. Contact with scholars in education, including a checklist battery similar to that in the educational researchers' questionnaire, most important contacts, rewarding aspects and problems of contacts, reactions to the teaching of education students, and attitudes toward taking a job in a school of education.
3. Features of research. Questions were designed to parallel those asked of educational researchers, for use in a comparative analysis. They covered topics of research, time budgets, communication channels, productivity, attitudes to applied

research, professional honors, etc.

4. Opinions on selected issues in education. These questions cover attitudes on the quality of educational research, its prestige, the training of researchers, etc.
5. Background and career information. Items comparable to those asked of educational researchers were included. Among them are present job, career history, education, membership in professional associations, journals read, income, age, etc.

Copies of the educational researchers' and behavioral scientists' questionnaires are appended to this report.

Qualitative interviews (collected by the writer)

Twenty-one interviews were obtained with selected personnel: researchers in education, professors trained in liberal arts who had worked in schools of education, and administrators, in graduate schools of education. The interviews were conducted in the New York and Boston areas, since the project budget did not permit extensive travel. The questions were non-directive. Specific items varied with the type of respondent, but the following topics were covered in all interviews:

1. Background of the respondent, including training
2. Career line of the respondent
3. Reasons for his decision to enter or leave education
4. Contacts with scholars "across the street"
5. Problems and satisfactions relating to these contacts
6. Observations about how well any given arrangements for contact was working out at the respondent's own institution.

7. Observations about the effect of contact with liberal arts on personnel trained in education and emphasizing professional goals
8. Observations about the role played by the funding agencies in bringing educational researchers into contact with patterns of research in the liberal arts.
9. In the case of administrators: future plans for relations with the liberal arts, including regional laboratories.

Additional field interviews (collected by Sieber-Lazarsfeld)

A field representative was commissioned to do a case study of a regional laboratory connected with a school of education in a western state. In addition, Dr. Sieber conducted field interviews with research bureau directors at several other schools. These materials were used as background for the present report.

Survey of authors (collected by Sieber-Lazarsfeld)

A post card was sent to a sample of 811 authors whose work was published in 38 journals in the year of 1964. The institutional affiliations, fields of concentration, and patterns of co-authorship of these researchers were covered in this instrument. Although not part of the present investigation, these materials were also utilized as background information.

Arts and Humanities Branch
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW. - Rm. 3-2-065
Washington, D. C. 20202

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE LIBERAL ARTS: SUMMARY

Leiba Brown, under sponsorship of
Professor Paul F. Lazarsfeld
Professor of Sociology
Department of Sociology
Associate Director
Bureau of Applied Social Research
Columbia University
New York, New York

Project Number S-087 5-8281

May 1, 1964 to October 31, 1965, with agreement to continue through January 31, 1966.

Background and Objectives.

Concern has long been expressed over the gap between education and the liberal arts disciplines. Over the years, educational research has moved towards a professional orientation and has concentrated upon the concerns of school systems and other immediate clients. This stress on applications has been criticized by scholars in the liberal arts. The present research was undertaken to survey the extent of contact between educational researchers and their colleagues in the liberal arts, and to locate organizational conditions in universities which would promote exchange of intellectual resources "across the street."

In studying the conditions which further contact between education and the liberal arts, several topics were chosen as guidelines:

1. Historical factors leading to different degrees of separation between education and the arts and sciences;
2. The role of the university power structure with respect to the gap;
3. The role played by organizational arrangements such as joint teaching in promoting contact.
4. Conditions for recruitment of liberal arts personnel to educational research;
5. The role of the funding agencies;
6. Consequences of different existing levels of contact between education and the disciplines.

The purpose of focusing on each of these topics was to determine those conditions which promote contact and narrow the gap between education and the other disciplines.

Procedures.

Some of the data for the project were already existing and were analyzed by the writer. In addition, new materials were collected. The different types of data include:

1. Institutional surveys of the deans, research coordinators, and research bureau directors in 107 graduate schools of education and their affiliated research units. These data were collected by Sieber and Lazarsfeld as part of Cooperative Research Project #1974. In each survey, questions were designed and inserted by the writer. These questions covered the contacts between schools of education or research bureaus and liberal arts faculty in the academic departments and professional schools. The responses to these questions about contact were then analyzed by the writer in relation to other characteristics of the schools of education.

2. Data collected by the writer have three parts: a) a questionnaire survey of 535 educational researchers in 77 of the 107 graduate schools of education mentioned above. Included in this survey was a subsample of research leaders. b) A study of representatives from the liberal arts. Specifically, a sample of 727 behavioral scientists taken from the psychology and sociology departments at the same 77 schools was studied,

using a mail questionnaires. c) Interviews were conducted with 21 leading representatives from both education and the liberal arts, including several people who had spent considerable time in both a liberal arts department and a school of education. The bulk of the interviews came from two major universities which form case studies in themselves.

In addition, miscellaneous documentary materials were utilized and are described in the appendix. Details concerning each of the instruments are also to be found in the appendix.

Results.

1. Existing arrangements for contact between educational research and the liberal arts were surveyed in both schools of education and research bureaus. Occasions for contact were found to be relatively rare in both contexts. The most frequently reported types of contact were joint examination committees for the doctorate, joint teaching appointments, and research consultations.

2. The following factors were shown to be related to the existence of joint arrangements:

a. University quality;

b. Preference for research over other activities by education deans;

c. Preference for research over other activities by education faculty;

d. Reported absence of a "problem" drawing personnel away from research and into field service.

3. More individual contacts were reported by education professors than by behavioral scientists.

4. On the level of individual contacts, informal contacts were more frequently reported than formal ones.

5. Interviewees in the study as well as survey respondents from the liberal arts voiced objections to the stress placed on applied research in schools of education. This was held to pose problems for recruitment of liberal arts-trained researchers into educational research.

6. A substantial minority of behavioral science professors indicated a willingness to take a job in a school of education if given an opportunity to do research of their own choosing. Other potential inducements included rank or salary increases and the possibility of a better location.

7. A greater proportion of education professors than behavioral scientists were found to stress applications as being very important or moderately important to their research. Similarly, more educationists than behavioral scientists refused to consider doing research on a topic which had no practical application.

8. Time budgets were examined for the three groups of professors. Behavioral scientists indicated they spend more time in research than did educators. Conversely, educators spent more time than behavioral scientists in field service.

9. Several other areas of research practice were studied. It was found that the patterns of doing research were the same for the three groups, although the content differed:

   a. No substantial differences were found in channels of scientific communication utilized by the three groups.

   b. No substantial differences were found in the extent of research leadership present in the three groups.

   c. No substantial differences were found in the preferences of the three groups for continuity in either concepts, methods, or subject matter.

10. Educators were found to be an older group than behavioral scientists and to have taken longer to complete their graduate education.

Conclusions.

Any conclusions to date must be tentative, since further findings are to be reported in the dissertation based on this project. The present data strongly suggest that contacts between education and the liberal arts are not fully institutionalized where they do exist. The stress on applications in the schools of education was considered as one possible hindrance to institutionalization. As a very preliminary recommendation, it was suggested that bringing liberal-arts-trained researchers into schools of education should be supplemented by encouraging educational

researchers to affiliate directly with professional societies and other groups in the liberal arts and to publish in their journals wherever possible.

Bibliography.

There are 13 references listed in the literature section of the final report.

Publications.

There are no publications to date.